



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,032	09/22/2003	Daniel Benigni	LD0283 NP	1431

23914 7590 03/01/2006

LOUIS J. WILLE
BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY
PATENT DEPARTMENT
P O BOX 4000
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-4000

EXAMINER

LILLING, HERBERT J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1651

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Art Unit: 1651

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the prior art information disclosure statement filed January 12, 2004 and April 05, 2004.

2. Claims 1-47 are pending in this application.

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-19, drawn to a **process** for the isolation of epothilone, classified in class 435, subclass 120.
- II. Claims 20 and 31, drawn to a further process to prepare a **derivative 2**, classified in class 435, subclass 116+.
- III. Claims 21 and 30, drawn to a further process to prepare a **derivative 1** drawn to a, classified in class 435, subclass 116+.
- IV. Claims 22 and 32, drawn to a further process to prepare a **derivative 3**, classified in class 435, subclass 116+.
- V. Claims 23-29, drawn to a **second process for cultivation of a microorganism to produce epothilone A** or epothilone B wherein the timing of feeding and amount of compound are selected to provide at least a two-fold increase in the ratio of the two epothilones, classified in Class 435, subclass 4.
- VI. Claims 33-36, drawn to a strain of *Sorangium cellulosum*, classified in Class 435, subclass 252.1.

Art Unit: 1651

VII. Claims 37-47, drawn to a **third process of purifying** an epothilone by HPLC column, classified in Class 548, subclass 181.

Each of the processes is separate and distinct from each other that involve different process steps. Inventions II, III and IV are drawn to improperly claimed processes, which do not limit Invention I but are drawn to patentably distinct processes drawn to patentably distinct products.

Invention VI is drawn to a product that is patentably distinct from the process inventions.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter and the search required for one invention is not required for the other invention and the search and examination of any additional inventions other than the elected invention would be burdensome on this examiner due to the above indication that requires different searches. Thus, the restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Whereby the strain of *Sorangium cellulosum* is selected from the following

- a. A strain that produces epothilones with an epothilone B/Z ratio of at least 1.0;
- b. ATCC PTA-3880;
- c. ATCC PTA-3881;

d. Any other strain-please specify

The species are independent or distinct because each of the above is drawn to a different strain that requires a separate search and examination.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 33 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.
MPEP § 809.02(a).

5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or

Art Unit: 1651

without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

6. In accordance with the policy of Tech Center 1600, the following paragraphs will be considered in view of F.P.: Ochiai/Brouwer Rejoinder form paragraph

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Art Unit: 1651

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

7. With respect to the strain(s), Applicant may be required whatever

Invention is elected to be in full compliance with US Rules of Deposits as recited:

It is apparent that strain is required to practice the claimed invention(s) as recited in the claims. As a required element it must be known and readily available to the public or obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification. If it is not so obtainable or available, a deposit of strain may satisfy the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, in full compliance with U.S. Rules. See 37 C. F. R. 1.802.

The specification does not provide a repeatable method for obtaining the strain and it does not appear to be a readily available material. Deposit of strain would satisfy the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. If a deposit has been made, Applicant is required to meet the necessary criteria of the deposit rules in accordance with 37 CFR 1.801-37 CFR 1.809.

If a deposit has not been supplied or made under the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by Applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the deposit has been made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty **and that all restrictions** imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public

Art Unit: 1651

of the deposited material will be **irrevocably removed** upon the granting of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirements, See 37 CFR 1.808.

If a deposit is not made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by Applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the deposit has been made at an acceptable depository and that the following criteria have been met:

a) during the pendency of the application, access to the deposit will be afforded to one determined by the Commissioner to be entitled thereto;

b) all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited material **will be irrevocably** removed upon the granting of a patent;

c) the deposit will be maintained for a term of at least thirty (30) years and at least five (5) years after the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited material;

d) a viability statement in accordance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.807;

and

e) the deposit will be replaced should it become necessary due to inviability, contamination or loss of capability to function in the manner described in the specification.

In addition, **the identifying information set forth in 37 CFR 1.809(d) should be added to the specification**, See 37 CFR 1.803-37 CFR 1.809 for additional explanations of these requirements.

A brief review of the instant specification indicates that at least claims 33 and 34 lack sufficient information and data as well as for the deposited strains, which lack a sufficient amount of data in the instant specification.

In addition, there is a **possible rejection** based on the following claims:

Art Unit: 1651

Claim 5 the term "TASTONE" is a trademark and Claim 14 the term XAD-16 is not a known compound or composition. These terms may be considered to be totally improper and possibly will be rejected in an action on the merits.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

9. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Examiner Lilling** whose **telephone number is 571-272-0918** and **Fax Number** is (703) 872-9306 or SPE Michael Wityshyn whose telephone number is 571-272-0926. Examiner can be reached Monday-Thursday from about 5:30 A.M. to about 3:00 P.M. Any inquiry of a general

Art Unit: 1651

nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

H.J.Lilling: HJL
(571) 272-0918
Art Unit 1651
February 28, 2006



Dr. Herbert J. Lilling
Primary Examiner
Group 1600 Art Unit 1651